Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24, 31-61 and 68-74 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 31, 38, and 68 being the independent claims. Claims 25-30 and 62-67 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

<u>Yu</u>

Claims 1-4, 31-41, and 68-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,167,560 to Yu (herein "Yu"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and provides the following arguments to support patentability.

Yu does not teach each of the foregoing features of claim 1. For example, as will be described in more detail below, Yu does not teach or suggest at least the features of "processing a second part of the message with a second level of encryption to produce a second message portion, including selecting the second level of encryption from a group consisting of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) a level of encryption less strong than the first level of encryption" as recited by claim 1.

Yu discloses *always partitioning* a stream-formatted media into cloak data and

non-cloak data followed by *only encrypting the cloak data*. According to Yu, a partial

encryptor unit 111

> receives either [a] compressed bitstream from [a] bitstream formatting
> unit 110 (or an uncompressed bitstream in the base domain), partitions the
> data stream into at least two segments (cloak data and non-cloak data),
> and encrypts at least one segment (cloak data) of the bitstream … with the
> effect being that of partial encryption.

> > (*see*, Yu, col. 5, lines 17-26).

For example, Yu provides that the stream-formatted media may be "partitioned along the

spatial dimension." (*see*, Yu, col. 6, lines 10-12). The stream-formatted media

> can be split into three sections, with a center section [(i.e., cloak data)]
> representing approximately 1/2 of [an] image and each of the outer
> sections [(i.e., non-cloak data)] representing approximately 1/4 of the
> image. The center section can be encrypted while the outer sections can
> be left unencrypted.

> > (*see*, Yu, col. 6, lines 13-17).

As another example, Yu provides that the stream-formatted media may "partitioned

along the temporal dimension." (*see*, Yu, col. 6, lines 21-23). The stream-formatted

media may be divided

> into odd blocks and even blocks. Either the odd blocks or the even blocks
> can then be encrypted.
> > (*see*, Yu, col. 6, lines 24-27).

As these aforementioned examples demonstrate, Yu *always* partitions a stream-formatted

media into cloak data and non-cloak data followed by *only encrypting the cloak data*.

Yu does teach or suggest encrypting the non-cloak data.

A feature of claim 1 recites "processing a second part of the message with a

second level of encryption to produce a second message portion, including *selecting* the

second level of encryption from a group consisting of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) a level

of encryption less strong than the first level of encryption." In other words, a message

includes a first part and a second part. According to claim 1, the "first part of the

message [is encrypted] with a first level of encryption." (*see*, claim 1). The "second part

of the message [is processed] with a second level of encryption. (*see*, claim 1). Whereas

Yu teaches or suggests not encrypting the non-cloak data, claim 1 recites selecting the

second level of encryption from "a group consisting of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) a level

of encryption less strong than the first level of encryption." (*see*, claim 1).

Accordingly, Yu does not teach or suggest at least the features of "processing a

second part of the message with a second level of encryption to produce a second

message portion, with the second level of encryption selectable from a group consisting

of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) a level of encryption less strong than the first level of

encryption" as recited by claim 1. Consequently, Yu cannot anticipate claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4 are likewise not anticipated by Yu for the same reasons as claim 1

from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35

U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Likewise, Yu does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 31. For

example, as discussed above in regards to claim 1, Yu does not teach or suggest at least

the feature of "selecting a second encryption algorithm from a group consisting of: (i) no

encryption, and (ii) encryption algorithms requiring less processing overhead than

required by said first encryption algorithm" as recited by claim 31. Consequently, Yu

cannot anticipate claim 31. Dependent claims 32-37 are likewise not anticipate by Yu

for the same reasons as claim 31 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Similarly, Yu does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 38. For example, as discussed above in regards to claim 1, Yu does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "second processing means for encrypting a second part of said message to produce a second message portion, using a second level of encryption from a group consisting of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) a level of encryption less strong than said first level of encryption" as recited by claim 38. Consequently, Yu cannot anticipate claim 38. Dependent claims 39-41 are likewise not anticipate by Yu for the same reasons as claim 38 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Likewise, Yu does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 68. For example, as discussed above in regards to claim 1, Yu does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "a second encryption algorithm selectable from a group consisting of: (i) no encryption, and (ii) those algorithms requiring less processing overhead than required by said first encryption algorithm" as recited by claim 68. Consequently, Yu cannot anticipate claim 68. Dependent claims 69-74 are likewise not anticipate by Yu for the same reasons as claim 68 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 68-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.3820001

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Yu in view of Nag

Claims 5-24 and 42-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yu in view of United States Patent No. 7,266,683 to Nag (herein "Nag"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide the following arguments to support patentability.

As discussed above, Yu does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 38. Nag does not provide the missing teachings or suggestions with respect to claims 1 and 38 nor does the Office Action allege that Nag provides the missing teachings or suggestions with respect to claims 1 and 38. Thus, the combination of Yu and Nag does not render obvious claims 1 and 38. Dependent claims 5-24 and 42-53 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Yu and Nag for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5-24 and 42-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: ___5/22/08___

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
823540_1.DOC

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.3820001